

### REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Office action dated March 9, 2007 and have amended the application to more clearly set forth the invention. Claims 1-3, 5-17, 19-24, 28, 30, 35-39 and 42-44 have been amended; claim 46 has been added, and claims 4 and 18 have been canceled by this Amendment A. Thus, claims 1-3, 5-17 and 19-46 are presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### Double Patenting

Claims 1-45 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-3 and 5-45 of Application No. 10/044,565. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections of claims 1-45, Applicants will consider filing a terminal disclaimer to obviate these rejections when the present application is otherwise in condition for allowance.

#### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 23 and 35-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 23 and 35-38 have been amended to recite a "computer-readable storage medium". Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 23 and 35-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 should be withdrawn.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants note that claim 18 has been canceled by this Amendment A.

#### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carter et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,742,114). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully disagree, and assert that Carter fails to teach or suggest "receiving a request specifying at least one action relating to the administration of user accounts in the namespace" as claimed in amended independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, the rejection under § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Carter et al. discloses a principal requesting authorization from the Distributed Deputization Point (DDP). (Carter et al., column 8, lines 19-21) The DDP then sends an authentication response to the principal. (Carter et al., column 8, lines 45-46) Once authenticated, "the principal sends the DDP a deputy credential request". (Carter et al., column 9, lines 4-5). In response to this request, "the DDP creates a deputy credential". (Carter et al., column 9, lines 4-5). In other words, Carter et al. teaches that the DPP creates a deputy credential in response to the request.

In contrast, claim 1 as amended, recites:

associating a plurality of namespaces with a plurality of administration servers, wherein each of the namespaces is associated with one of the plurality of administration servers, each of the administration servers providing a service relating to the associated namespace for one or more **user accounts of the namespace**, said authentication server and said administration servers being connected via a data communication network, **said user accounts of the namespaces being managed by the authentication server, said authentication server being authorized to authenticate user accounts of the namespace;**

receiving, by the authentication server, a request from one of the administration servers, said authentication server having a database associated therewith storing authentication information for authenticating the **users accounts of each of the namespaces**, said one of the administration servers being responsive to an administrator for issuing the request to said authentication server, said **request specifying at least one action relating to the administration of user accounts in the namespace** associated with said one of the administration servers for managing the database to be performed by the authentication server to the namespace;

verifying, by the authentication server, authority of said one of the administration servers to issue the request received by the authentication server; and

performing, by the authentication server, the action specified by the received, verified request. (emphasis added)

For example, on page 25, the specification of the present application discloses that the administrative server can add accounts to the managed namespace; on page 34, the specification of the present application discloses that the administrative server can delete accounts from the managed namespace; and on page 32 the specification of the present application discloses that the administrative server can reset the password of a user account of the managed namespace. In another example, the authentication server receives a request from the administrative server to create an account for the administrative server then the authentication server authenticates the

administrative server and, if authenticated, creates the account. (Specification, page 25, lines 1-10).

The cited art fails to anticipate each and every element of claim 1 such as receiving a request specifying at least one action relating to the **administration of user accounts** in the namespace. In fact, Carter fails to even consider the notion of user accounts within the namespace such as claimed in amended independent claim 1. As such, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be withdrawn. Claims 2, 3, 5-17, 19-23 and 46 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. To the extent that amended independent claims 24, 36 and 39 include limitations similar to amended independent claim 1, these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is believed to be allowable. Claims 25-35, 37-38 and 40-45 depend from claims 24, 36 and 39, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend are allowable.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-21, 23-25, 27-41, and 43-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (U.S. Pub. 2002/0165960) in view of Carter et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,742,114). Applicants respectfully disagree, and assert that none of the cited art, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "receiving a request specifying at least one action relating to the **administration of user accounts** in the namespace" as recited in amended claim 1.

As explained above, Carter et al. teaches that the DPP creates a deputy credential in response to the request. Chan teaches a method for centralization of the repositories for policies and user identity profiles while decentralizing their administration. (Chan, paragraph 86). However, Chan fails to disclose receiving a request specifying at least one action relating to the **administration of user accounts** in the namespace.

Thus, none of the cited art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests such a limitation. As such, the rejection of claim 1 under § 103(a) should be withdrawn. To the extent that amended independent claims 24, 36 and 39 include limitations similar to amended independent claim 1, these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is believed to be allowable. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1, 24, 36 and 39 and the rejected claims depending therefrom are allowable.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 24, 36 and 39 are allowable over the cited art. The claims depending from these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested. Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

**The Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/James J. Barta, Jr./

James J. Barta, Jr., Reg. No. 47,409  
SENNIGER POWERS  
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102  
(314) 231-5400

JJB/BAW/cjl